



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/788,750	02/27/2004	Gord Nelson	Nelson.G-02(ST)	8498
22197	7590	10/30/2006	EXAMINER	
PATENT LAW & VENTURE GROUP 2424 S.E. BRISTOL, SUITE 300 NEWPORT BEACH, CA 92660				CHEUNG, VICTOR
ART UNIT		PAPER NUMBER		
				3709

DATE MAILED: 10/30/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

<b>Office Action Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b>	<b>Applicant(s)</b>	
	10/788,750	NELSON, GORD	
	<b>Examiner</b>	<b>Art Unit</b>	
	Victor Cheung	3709	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

#### Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

#### Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**.                    2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

#### Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-5 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

#### Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on 27 February 2004 is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

#### Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
  - a) All    b) Some \* c) None of:
    1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
    2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
    3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

#### Attachment(s)

- |   |   |
|---|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)           |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)  | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.                                     |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>05-26-2004</u> . | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
|   | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____.                         |

## **DETAILED ACTION**

### ***Drawings***

1. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because of the following:

- Reference character “80” has been used to designate both the “tee area” and the “video monitor” (see Fig. 1).
- Reference character “130” has been used to designate both the “charging connector” and the “coin device” (see Fig. 3). Note: in the specification, the “charging connector” is designated by reference character “110” (Page 11, Line 1). However, reference character “110” is also used to designate the “inverter” (Fig. 3; also Page 10, Line 11).

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. Each drawing sheet submitted after the filing date of an application must be labeled in the top margin as either “Replacement Sheet” or “New Sheet” pursuant to 37 CFR 1.121(d). If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

*Specification*

2. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities (also note the Drawings objections above):

- Reference character “80” has been used to designate both the “tee area” and the “video monitor” (Page 10, Lines 3 and 8).
- Reference character “110” has been used to designate both the “inverter” and the “charging connector” (Page 10 and 11, Lines 11 and 1, respectively).

Appropriate correction is required.

*Claim Objections*

3. Claims 1 and 5 are objected to because of the following informalities:

Regarding Claim 1 Line 1: The phrase “A golf-related game with video recording system apparatus comprising:” is not clear as to whether the claimed subject matter is directed to the video recording system or an apparatus for a golf-related game. It is suggested to be changed to --An apparatus for a golf-related game with video recording system, the apparatus comprising: --.

Regarding Claim 1 Line 4: The term “sheltering” makes the claim unclear as to whether the field house structure is a shelter or if it is sheltering other components. In both cases it is not clear if the components a) b) c) that follow it are components of the field house structure or the apparatus for the golf-related game. The phrase “a field-house structure sheltering” should be changed to --a field-house structure comprising--.

Regarding Claim 5 Line 1: The phrase "A golf-related game method using a video recording system apparatus, the method comprising..." is not clear as to whether the claimed method is directed to the video recording system or an apparatus for a golf-related game. It is suggested to be changed to --A method for playing a golf-related game apparatus with video recording system, the method comprising: --.

Regarding Claims 5 Line 4: The verb "sheltering" does not make clear the limitations of the method claim. The phrase "sheltering within the at least one field-house structure:" should be changed to --the at least one field-house structure comprising: --

Appropriate correction is required.

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

4. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

5. Claims 1-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Shirley (US Patent No. 4,934,705) in view of Chang et al. (US Patent No. 5,342,054), Nation (US Patent No. 6,012,987), and Vincent (US Patent No. 5,102,140).

Regarding Claims 1-2: Shirley discloses a golf related game with a video recording system comprising a golf course comprising at least one hole (1), a tee area (7), and a green area (3), and positioned at the tee area, a field-house structure (9) with a video monitor (11), an electrical power source including solar panels (25), and trigger means (15) for actuating the system (Figs. 1 and 3; Col. 1 Lines 51-58; Col. 2 Lines 54-57).

However, Shirley does not disclose a computer providing a four-channel wireless video data stream, a set of four solar powered video cameras each having a motion sensor actuation switch, or a coin operated system switch.

Chang et al. disclose a golfing apparatus comprising a set of four cameras (24, 26, 28, 30), a computer providing a four channel video data stream (32), and a video recording apparatus (40) (Figs. 1 and 4).

Nation discloses recreational golf game plurality of camera systems placed at different locations on a golf course, each comprising a camera (8), a motion sensor (20), a data processing center capable of receiving and storing information from the camera and motion sensor, and a video monitor capable of receiving and displaying video from the processing center (Figs. 1-3; Col. 2 Lines 15-27; Col. 4 Lines 1-8).

Vincent discloses a multiple camera golf recording system comprising a tee enclosure (15) at the tee area and a VCR unit (21) to record from the cameras, the enclosure actuated by coin-operation (18) (Figs. 1-3; Col. 2 Lines 18-24). Vincent also discloses the tee enclosure (15) positioned for viewing a line of flight of a golf ball drive from the tee area.

Thus in view of Chang et al., Nation, and Vincent, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to set up the apparatus as taught by

Art Unit: 3709

Chang et al. in the tee area shelter structure of Shirley. The four channel video recording and display system would allow golfers on the golf course to view and analyze their game from four different angles simultaneously. By including the video camera system as taught by Nation throughout the golf course, the golfers could view and analyze their game throughout the golf course at all strokes instead of just the tee area. Because the taught cameras are equipped with motion sensors, it saves energy and resources since there is no need to record video data when no activity is present.

Additionally, it would have been obvious to use the solar panels as taught by Shirley with the video camera system, saving resources with a constant free source of energy, and then to make the cameras operate wirelessly, removing any unsightly wires that would detract from the aesthetic value of the golf course. By including the coin-operation apparatus as taught by Vincent to the video system in the shelter structure modified by Chang et al., the operators of the golf course can profit monetarily from the video recording system and ensure that only those golfers interested in recording their game will use the video recording system, since constant use and wear can detract from the lifespan of each component.

Regarding Claim 3: It would also have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have the plurality of cameras disclosed by Nation pointed in a same general direction allowing for multiple angles of the same event. Like many camera surveillance systems, the video system could have been enabled to track the motion of a passing ball as well.

Regarding Claim 4: Although the teachings of Shirley as modified by Chang et al., Nation, and Vincent do not disclose a charging connector adapted for charging the battery by a standard AC power source, the charging of batteries from an AC power source is well known in the art. It would

Art Unit: 3709

have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to enable the battery to be charged by a standard AC power source. Because solar power is dependent on the amount of sunlight available that is not always constant, alternate forms of electricity must be made available when solar energy is not abundant or sufficient.

Regarding Claim 5: It is observed that the method claimed in Claim 5 performs the act of providing the elements of the apparatus in Claims 1-4, then activating the apparatus by a golfing party.

It is obvious that in order to use the disclosed apparatus, one would be required to provide the elements as described. Additionally, Vincent discloses the game method of inserting one or more coins into the coin-operated controller, playing a golf ball from the tee, and monitoring the video images stored by the recording means (Col. 2 Lines 18-24). The motion sensors disclosed by Nation would activate the video cameras when activity is sensed around the designated areas.

Thus it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to perform the method steps described in order to make use and bring utility to the apparatus.

### ***Conclusion***

6. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Nauck discloses a golf shot tracking system with a plurality of cameras connected to data processors, video monitors, and related hardware and software.

- Ainsworth et al. disclose an apparatus for tracking and identifying golf balls including video cameras in cup assemblies that are solar powered and transmit data wirelessly.
- Cleveland discloses a golf video system able to process multiple video camera streams.
- Maeda discloses a golf video recording system with a camera that is actuated by breaking the path of an infrared beam.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Victor Cheung whose telephone number is (571) 270-1349. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday, 8:30AM-5:00PM and every other Friday, 8:30AM-4:00PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Jong-Suk (James) Lee can be reached on (571) 272-7044. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

V.C  
10/26/06



JONG SUK LEE  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER